

REMARKS

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent number 5,959,529 (hereinafter *Kail*) in view of U.S. patent number 6,282,469 (hereinafter *Rogers*), U.S patent number 5,400,246 (hereinafter *Wilson*), U.S. patent application number 2004/00909950 (herein after *Lauber*). *Office Action*, 2. The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. See *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). The Applicants submit that *Kail*, *Rogers*, *Wilson*, and *Lauber*, individually or in combination, fail to teach or disclose ‘process[ing] the raw data,’ ‘calibration information’ with respect to the sensor and processing raw data, and ‘wirelessly download[ing] updates to the stored calibration information.’

Process the Raw Data Based on at least the Calibration Information

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly reflect that it is directed toward an apparatus that ‘monitor[s] a remote site’ and that ‘wirelessly’ transmits and downloads information from a server. More specifically, claim 1 now recites that the apparatus includes a sensor that ‘detect[s] an environmental condition at the remote site upon receipt of a command to enable the sensor’ and ‘obtain[s] raw data concerning the detected environmental condition.’ The apparatus further ‘process[es] the raw data based on at least the calibration information stored in the memory device’ and ‘wirelessly download[s] updates to the stored calibration information.’

The Examiner admits that *Kail* does not disclose the claimed ‘control board.’ *Office Action*, 3. *Kail* therefore cannot disclose that ‘the control board [is] configured to receive the raw data from a variety of types of data collection devices, including the remote sensor, process the raw data based on at least the calibration information stored in the memory device, place the processed data into at least one packet, transmit the at least one packet in a wireless communication from the control board to a server, and wirelessly download updates to the stored calibration information,’ as recited in independent claim 1.

The Examiner argues that *Rogers* discloses such a control board. *Office Action*, 3-4. The Examiner does not address that the claimed ‘control board [is] configured to . . . process the raw data based on at least the calibration information,’ as recited in claim 1. *Rogers* merely discloses a “multi-point serial link protocol . . . used to transfer vehicle diagnostic information back and forth between vehicle diagnostic sensors and a host computer.” *Rogers*, Abstract. While *Rogers* discloses “[m]icrocontroller within board” and a “serial communication protocol,” *Rogers* does **not** disclose a ‘control board’ that is ‘configured to . . . **process the raw data based on at least the calibration information.**’ *Rogers*, 6:16, The addition of *Wilson* and *Lauber* does not cure *Kail*’s and *Rogers*’ failure – individually or in any combination – to disclose the processing of the raw data based on calibration information. Each of the references further fail, individually or in any combination, to disclose ‘wirelessly download[ing] updates to the stored calibration information.’

Because each dependent claim incorporates by reference all the claim limitations of the independent claim upon which it depends, *Kail*, *Rogers*, *Wilson*, and *Lauber*, individually or in combination, further fail to disclose all the claim limitations of the dependent claims, which are allowable for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner's rejections of claims 1-5, 10-, 13, 15, 21, 26-29, 35, and 36 are overcome in that the cited references fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The Applicants have evidenced the failure of *Kail*, *Rogers*, *Wilson*, and *Lauber*, individually or in combination, to disclose each and every element of the independent claims, including at least "control board configured to . . . process the raw data based on at least the calibration information" and "wirelessly download[ing] updates to the stored calibration information," as recited in the amended independent claim 1.

Any claim dependent upon one of the aforementioned independent claim—either directly or via an intermediate dependent claim—is allowable for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends. As such, each and every one of the dependent claims of the present application are also in condition for allowance.

As all rejections have been overcome, the Applicants contend the present application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative with any questions concerning the present amendment.

Respectfully submitted,
Gregory Glenn et al.

December 18, 2008

By: /Tam Thanh Pham/
Tam Thanh Pham (Reg. No. 50,565)
CARR & FERRELL LLP
2200 Geng Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
T: 650.812.3400
F: 650.812.3444